

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the drawing sheets for Figures 1, 2, 6, 9, 18, and 19 with the replacement drawing sheets attached to the Submission of Corrected Drawings submitted herewith.

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. In the non-final Office Action dated June 28, 2006, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) Objected to the Drawings.
- B.) Objected to the specification.
- C.) Rejected claims 15-28 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 101.
- D.) Rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Devine, et al.* (U.S. 2002/0095399) ("Devine").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and addresses the Examiner's disposition below.

A.) Objected to the Drawings:

The specification at page 9, line 4, has been amended to describe that the file server 150 includes a file server storage 154. File server storage 154 is also disclosed, for example, in Figures 1, 18, and 19. Figure 1 has also been amended to include a legend for some of the item labels.

Figure 2 has been amended to delete items 244 and 264. Figure 2 has also been amended to include a legend for some of the item labels.

The Examiner commented that item 2206 appears in both Figures 2 and 22. This is correctly shown in Figures 2 and 22 and described in the specification, for example at page 43, line 10.

Figure 6 has been amended to replace item --614-- with item --612--, item --616-- with item --614--, and item --618-- with item --616--.

The specification at page 24, line 12, has been amended to label the text associated with "step 710," which is also identified in Figure 7.

Figure 9 has been amended to include a textual description.

Figure 18 has been amended to replace item --152-- with item --150--.

Figure 19 has been amended to replace item --152-- with item --150--.

Please replace the drawing sheets for Figures 1, 2, 6, 9, 18, and 19 with the replacement drawing sheets attached to the Submission of Corrected Drawings submitted herewith.

Additional amendments have been made to the specification, as described below in Section B, to correct informalities and to overcome the Examiner's objections to the drawings.

These amendments are made as per the Examiner's request to overcome the objections and to

correct informalities.

No new matter is introduced by the amendments made herein.

Applicant respectfully submits the objections have been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

B.) Objection to the specification:

The specification at page 21, line 7, has been amended to change the first occurrence of “step 622” to “step 620.”

The specification at page 24, line 21, has been amended to change “step 720” to “step 716.”

The specification at page 27, line 2, has been amended to label the client module API as item 1002, which is also identified in Figure 10.

The specification at page 37, line 3, has been amended to replace item --152-- with item --150--.

The specification at page 44, line 19, has been amended to delete “a draws.”

The specification at page 45, line 1, has been amended to change “Firs” to “First.”

The specification at page 45, line 18, has been amended to change “Its” to “It.”

The specification at page 45, line 34, has been amended to change “step 2606” to “step 2602.”

The specification at page 47, line 5, has been amended to change “intellectual” to “intellectual capital.”

Applicant respectfully submits the objection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

C.) Rejected claims 15-28 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 101:

Claim 15 has been amended to clarify that the computer-readable medium is a tangible computer-readable medium.

Claims 16-28 depend directly or indirectly from claim 15 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 15 is allowable.

Claim 30 has been canceled.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

D.) Rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Devine, et al.* (U.S. 2002/0095399) (“*Devine*”):

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Independent claims 1, 15, and 29 each claim subject matter relating to obtaining information describing a datatype to be registered. The datatype has a metadata that describes a data and a reference to the data. The data is maintained separately from the datatype. The information describing the datatype includes a class field that is common to other datatypes and an instance field that is specific to the datatype. The information describing the datatype is stored in a registry. At least a portion of the information describing the datatype is included in the datatype's metadata.

This is clearly unlike *Devine*. To begin with, *Devine* fails to disclose or suggest registering datatypes. The Examiner cites *Devine* [390] and argues that that paragraph discloses registering datatypes. *Office Action of 6/28/06*, page 7. *Devine* [390] describes how data files can be registered in a database. However, the Examiner then goes on to allege that *Devine*'s services are datatypes. Nowhere does *Devine* suggest registering its services. It appears that the Examiner is picking and choosing different elements from *Devine* in an attempt to disclose Applicant's claimed invention, however, the different elements contradict. Applicant's claimed invention relates to registering a datatype. *Devine* does not register a datatype, it merely registers data files that are in a database. For at least this reason, *Devine* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 15, and 29.

Further, *Devine* fails to teach an information that includes an instance field that is specific to a datatype. The Examiner cites *Devine* [548] and alleges that that paragraph teaches an instance field that is specific to a datatype. However, as the Examiner quotes, that paragraph merely discusses that a user can browse metadata of a service. *Office Action of 6/28/06*, page 8. Nowhere does *Devine* [548] or any other paragraph of *Devine* disclose storing information in a registry that includes an instance field that is specific to a datatype. For at least this additional reason, *Devine* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 15, and 29.


Claims 2-14 and 16-28 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 or 15 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 15 are allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-29 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHN, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Telephone 312/876-2606
Customer #58328
Attorneys for Applicant(s)